

### **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

#### **Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1 and 2 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S Patent No. 6,697,130 to Weindorf et al. (hereafter "Weindorf") in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,697,042 to Cohen et al. (hereafter "Cohen").

Claims 4, 7-8, 26, 28 and 29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,781,648 to Takahasi et al. (hereafter "Takahasi") in view of Weindorf and Cohen.

Claim 6 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahasi in view of Weindorf and Cohen, further in view of European Patent Application No. EP 0580908 to Uratani (hereafter "Uratani").

#### **Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 8, 26 and 29, and canceled claims 7 and 28 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8, 26 and 29 remain pending in this application for further reconsideration.

#### **All claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1 and 2 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weindorf in view of Cohen. Claims 4, 7-8, 26, 28 and 29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahasi in view of Weindorf and Cohen. Claim 6

remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahasi in view of Weindorf and Cohen, further in view of Uratani. To the extent that the rejections might be applied against the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed as being based on a reference or a combination of references that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited in the claims.

With regard to independent claim 1, as newly-amended, Applicants respectfully submit that Weindorf and Cohen, whether taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a claimed combination including at least a recited feature of “wherein the common substrate is disposed at a rear of the housing,” a recited feature of “each of the plurality of light emitting diodes has light-emitting portions disposed inside the housing and body portions disposed outside the housing such that the housing surrounds the light-emitting portions of the plurality of light emitting diodes,” and a recited feature of “wherein upper surface and one side surface of the light-emitting portions of the plurality of light emitting diodes are opposite to the housing, and other side surface of the light-emitting portions of the plurality of light emitting diodes is opposite to a light-incidence surface of the light-guiding plate.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and its dependent claim 2 are each allowable over Weindorf and Cohen.

With regard to independent claims 4 and 26, as newly-amended, Applicants respectfully submit that Takahasi, Weindorf, Cohen, and Uratani whether taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a claimed combination including at least a recited feature of “wherein the common substrate is disposed at a rear of the housing,” a recited feature of “each of the plurality of light emitting diodes has light-emitting portions disposed inside the housing and body portions disposed outside the housing such that the housing

surrounds the light-emitting portions of the plurality of light emitting diodes,” and a recited feature of “wherein upper surface and one side surface of the light-emitting portions of the plurality of light emitting diodes are opposite to the housing, and other side surface of the light-emitting portions of the plurality of light emitting diodes is opposite to a light-incidence surface of the light-guiding plate.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 4 and 26, and their dependent claims 6, 8 and 29 are each allowable over Takahasi, Weindorf and Cohen.

MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 U SPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).” Accordingly, for at least the forgoing reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because the applied references, whether taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 1, 4 and 26, as newly-amended. Furthermore, the rejections of claims 2, 6, 8 and 29 should also be withdrawn at least because of their dependencies upon the respective independent claims 1, 4 and 26 and for the reasons as those set forth above.

With no other rejection pending, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 26 and 29 are in condition for allowance.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of

the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: February 14, 2008

By: 

Xiaobin You

Reg. No. L0112

**Customer No. 09629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: (202) 739-3000  
Facsimile: (202) 739-3001